

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

CLIFFORD L. RUCKER,
Plaintiff,

vs.

POLICE OFFICER HARDY, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-823
Black, J.
Litkovitz, M.J.

**REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff was granted *in forma pauperis* status in connection with a civil complaint filed on December 12, 2017 against defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 regarding civil rights violations. (Doc. 3). Plaintiff was informed by the Court to promptly notify the Court of any changes in plaintiff's address which may occur during the pendency of this lawsuit. (Doc. 2). On September 14, 2018, mail addressed to plaintiff was returned by the Post Office marked as "Return to sender – Not deliverable as addressed – Unable to forward." (Doc. 34).

On October 11, 2018, the Court issued an Order to plaintiff to show cause, in writing and within 15 days of the date of its Order, why the Court should not dismiss this case for lack of prosecution. (Doc. 35). The Order notified plaintiff that failure to comply with the terms of the Order would result in a recommendation to the District Judge that this action be dismissed. To date, there has been no response to the Court's Order to Show Cause.


"Federal courts possess certain 'inherent powers . . . to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.'" *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Haeger*, __ U.S. __, 137 S.Ct. 1178, 1186 (2017) (quoting *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-631 (1962)). Plaintiff's failure to respond to the Order to Show Cause warrants exercise of the Court's inherent power and dismissal of this case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure

to prosecute this matter. *See Link*, 370 U.S. at 630-31; *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109-10 (6th Cir. 1991).

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:

This case be **DISMISSED** with prejudice for want of prosecution pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Date: 10/30/18



Karen L. Litkovitz
United States Magistrate Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

CLIFFORD L. RUCKER,
Plaintiff,

vs.

POLICE OFFICER HARDY, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-823
Dlott, J.
Litkovitz, M.J.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).